10/10/71

Dear Howard,

I have been going over your valuable notes on the 1st art of PM. No offense intended, but if I can revert to what for yyou may be the dim past, you are becoming a nit-picker. This is not the same as a devil's advocate. I'm making this one note because I think it wouldbe constructive if the first time you are here wwe ggo o ver these notes to see if you can benefit from them. There are some of the things I'd already done, some I would do if other things were not more important, and some where you have just superimposed preconceptions of your own. You should by now be able to understand that what I am doing is thaking the official stuff apart. his doesnot mean that I must presume that the front and back so-called non-fatals are of the same origin, your assumption.

Take your note on 55 and reread it and tell me what is erroneous in my statement that until they ent to work on it all the evidence was of a front wound? Beginning from 12:30 11/22/63. This is entirely separate from anything from the back, except that you have made up your mind otherwise. Have you ever gone over all the early statements? All the doctors original said or thought this, all the news account are of it, etc.

As for your going for the Scavengers' shit, please tell me one of two things: that there is any reconstruction that is not 30% off or why they didn't use Z's camera and do it the right way? Was there any "reconstruction" possible for a camera that would yiled different results? Is there any evidence that this camera had a speed 20% off of Z's? Camera speeds are fairly steady. A 30% variation is almost impossible. Witness the CBS test.

And on 57, have you any doubt that Perry told Humes as he told the world that the Pres was shot from the front? He admitted to me that he said it and every quote is as I put it. To revet, "until" the Commission lawyers and Humes went to work on him.

Some of the pojnts are excellent, as adding Henkins on 67. But you persist in misconceptions, that I hang fonr entrance on the word puncture alone.

Your point on Stewart is well taken, but the defect lies in the inadequacy of the official record, and when this did happen and I report accurately what did happen, if the Commission saw fit to leave a record making it impossible to check it, the liability is theirs and, in the absence of any protest from any of the lawyers, I think it is my obligation to present it for what it may be worth. There is much more on this, like Huber, testimony in Shaw in DC, etc. It does not stand alone, and Specter's failure to ? McC is just too obvious. I do have a transcript, and Stewart could not have made the whole thing up. He said things not in the e idence, so the WR could not have been his source.

You would not gather from the foregoing that there are wide areas of agreement, that I had picked up much of what you suggest. For xample, what I've just come to, 90 and scale, which I had changed to a way you have not considered and should have. I think porbably I'm a bit anoyed because you claim to be the pope and I know you ar just a very bright Howard. Instead of just making constructive criticisms, which is what I need and want, you are insisting on imposing your point of view and your interpretations. There is room for all. The puncture business is the galling example, for you have simply ignored the context. Yoy have an excellent point on Frazier on 92, but I haven't time and it isn't needed. You are mininterpreting Shaw. He did not estify to what was <u>recovered</u> from the wrist wound.

Your comment on 93: you you not overlooked the possibility that this might have said "neck"?

94: you are right to say here we got again, but I'd say here <u>you</u> go again. You have no basis for connecting the back nd the front wounds. If you haven as an academic thing, give it. The e idence is in the opening citation to WW as above.

95 you call a Y cut nothing?

B ut your point on 124 is important, and I stop for that.

I had several Report outlines and can't locate 1! That was very important, Thanks. And you are right of its importance because of the two-month earlier date.

127 I have to retitle Postscript Suggestions solicited.

I'll be starting a PM file under Autipsy and I'll put this there so we can sometimes, if you'd like, go over it and get my criticisms. I d have taken more were there not now a great time you will ultimately understand better.

In time, when I can find it, I'll take what was in those two large files and file elsewhere, so they will disappear as a separate unit. But I don't know when. And there is mcuh in there I should have used, alas. But the thing is too big now.

In think t e hand notes I'll now get onto are RBs.

Againm thanks, HW